

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

MONICA I.,

Plaintiff, :

v.

**Case No. 2:24-cv-3699
Chief Judge Sarah D. Morrison
Magistrate Judge Chelsey M.
Vascura**

**COMMISSIONER OF
SOCIAL SECURITY, :**

Defendant.

ORDER

Plaintiff brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying her application for Social Security disability insurance benefits. (ECF No. 1-2.) Plaintiff filed her Statement of Errors on October 16, 2024. (ECF No. 7.) The Commissioner filed a Memorandum in Opposition. (ECF No. 11.) On December 9, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Court overrule Plaintiff’s Statement of Errors and affirm the Commissioner’s denial of benefits. (ECF No. 14.) Plaintiff timely filed her Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 15.)

If a party objects within the allotted time to a report and recommendation, the Court “shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Upon review, the Court “may

accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court’s review “is limited to determining whether the Commissioner’s decision ‘is supported by substantial evidence and was made pursuant to proper legal standards.’” *Ealy v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 594 F.3d 504, 512 (6th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Rogers v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 486 F.3d 234, 241 (6th Cir. 2007)); *see also* 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) (“The findings of the Commissioner of Social Security as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive . . .”).

The Court has carefully reviewed the record and concludes that the Commissioner’s decision is supported by substantial evidence and contains no reversible error. The issues raised in Plaintiff’s Objections were considered and correctly addressed by the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, the Court **OVERRULES** Plaintiff’s Objections (ECF No. 15), **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 14), and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner’s decision. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to **TERMINATE** this case from the docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Sarah D. Morrison
SARAH D. MORRISON, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT